UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,524	09/08/2003	Daryl S. Meredith	TN-3481	9167
7590 01/11/2010 Adan Ayala, Esq.			EXAMINER	
Black & Decker Inc.			DEXTER, CLARK F	
TW-199 701 E. Joppa Road			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Towson, MD 22			3724	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/11/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/657,524	MEREDITH, DARYL S.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Clark F. Dexter	3724		
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro te, cause the application to become ABANDO	DN. timely filed om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 I This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is FINAL . Since this application is in condition for allowatelessed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, p			
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 1-9,17 and 18 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-5 is/are withdrawr 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,6-9,17 and 18 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	n from consideration.			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	ccepted or b) objected to by the edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. Sometion is required if the drawing(s) is contact to the drawing(s).	tee 37 CFR 1.85(a). Objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:			

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 18, 2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 6-9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over European Publication 0 752 300 (hereafter EP '300) in view of one of Chang, pn 6,279,442 (hereafter Chang '442), Young, pn 6,513,412 and Chang, Pub. No. 2003/0213350 (hereafter Chang '350).

EP '300 discloses a saw (e.g., see Figs. 1-13 and 21) with almost every structural limitation of the claimed invention including:

a base (e.g., 12) for supporting a workpiece;

Application/Control Number:

10/657,524 Art Unit: 3724

a saw assembly (e.g., see col. 6, line 35 - col. 7, line 1) connected to the base, the saw assembly comprising a pivot arm, an upper blade guard (e.g., 18) connected to the pivot arm, a motor (e.g., 20) attached to the upper blade guard, and a blade (e.g., 16) driven by the motor, the saw assembly being movable between an upper position for not engaging the workpiece, and a lower position for engaging the workpiece (e.g., by the pivot located immediately below the motor 20 as viewed in Figure 1); and

a fence assembly attached to the base and disposed to one side of the blade, the fence assembly comprising

a fixed fence (e.g., 48) fixedly attached to the base and disposed on the one side of the blade, the fixed fence having a front portion, a rear portion with a substantially horizontal support surface and a channel between the front and rear portions,

a movable fence (e.g., 32) slidably connected to and removably connected to the fixed fence (e.g., as shown in Figure 5) and disposed on the one side of the blade, the movable fence being linearly movable horizontally relative to the fixed fence along the channel (e.g., 52 or 84), the movable fence defining a first support plane, at least one of the fixed fence and the movable fence for contacting the workpiece, and

an auxiliary fence (e.g., the upper, reduced cross-section portion of component 40) disposed on the one side of the blade behind the substantially horizontal support surface of the fixed fence, the auxiliary fence being higher than the highest point on the fixed fence and having a substantially vertical support surface extending upwardly above the substantially horizontal support surface of the fixed fence, the substantially

Art Unit: 3724

vertical support surface being along a second support plane substantially parallel to the first support plane (e.g., as shown in Fig. 4), so that when the movable fence (e.g., 32) is removed, no portion of the fence assembly is above the fixed fence (e.g., 48) and in front of the second support plane, allowing the auxiliary fence to contact the workpiece (e.g., the auxiliary fence 40 is fully capable of contacting a workpiece when the movable fence 32 is removed).

It is noted that various types of workpieces will meet this claim; for example, an irregular, but "substantially rectangular" shaped workpiece, a stepped "substantially rectangular" workpiece, a generally L-shaped "substantially rectangular" workpiece or the like, that includes a portion that rests on the workpiece support surface and another portion that extends to contact portion 40. It is emphasized that all of the abovedescribed manipulations, including selection of workpiece configurations, can be performed without modifying the prior art device as disclosed in the prior art document. and thus are considered to be functional recitations of intended use of the prior art device.

Regarding claims 6-9, EP '300 discloses the saw with every structural limitation of the claimed invention as further defined including

[claim 6] wherein the fixed fence has a support surface (e.g., at 107);

[claim 7 (from 6)] wherein the support surface is substantially parallel to an upper surface of the base;

[claim 8 (from 6)] wherein the support surface is substantially perpendicular to the first support plane;

[claim 9] wherein the fixed fence has a surface (e.g., 63) which is substantially coplanar with the first support plane;

[claim 18] wherein the first and second lines intersect at the contact point.

EP '300 lacks:

wherein the blade is movable to a position at least partially behind the auxiliary fence.

However, the Examiner takes Official notice that such blade assembly configurations wherein the blade is movable to a position at least partially behind the front surface of its support are old and well known in the art and provide various well known benefits including providing additional clearance from the workpiece area as well as to further expose the saw blade for maintenance and/or replacement. Chang '442, Young and Chang '350 each discloses at least one example of such a blade assembly configuration. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide such a blade assembly configuration on the device of EP '300 to gain the well known benefits including those described above.

Regarding claim 17, EP '300 discloses a saw with almost every structural limitation of the claimed invention but including first and second support planes as described above, but lacks the specific distance between these support planes being 1.65 inches. However, to make the distance 1.65 inches would be the mere discovery of the optimum or workable ranges within the general conditions of the prior art by routine experimentation and therefore obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art. It is

Art Unit: 3724

emphasized that the saw of EP '300 could clearly be constructed of a size or scale wherein such a distance is provided given what is taught by the disclosure of EP '300.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Again, applicant is welcome to contact the Examiner to discuss the claimed invention and possibly explore language in order to distinguish over the prior art.

Conclusion

- 5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clark F. Dexter whose telephone number is (571)272-4505. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer D. Ashley can be reached on (571)272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

10/657,524

Art Unit: 3724

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Clark F. Dexter/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3724

cfd

December 21, 2009